arXiv:math/0304123v2 [math.DS] 19 Sep 2003

# Kolmogorov - Sinaj entropy on MV-algebras

Beloslav Riečan [*]

**Abstract**

There is given a construction of the entropy of a dynamical system on arbitrary MV-algebra $M$. If $M$ is the MV-algebra of characteristic functions of a $\sigma$-algebra (isomorphic to the $\sigma$-algebra), then the construction leads to the Kolmogorov - Sinaj entropy. If $M$ is the MV-algebra (tribe) of fuzzy sets, then the construction coincides with the Maličký modification of the Kolmogorov - Sinaj entropy for fuzzy sets ([6], [14], [15]).

## 1 Introduction

If $(\Omega, \mathcal{S}, P)$ is a probability space and $T : \Omega \to \Omega$ is a measure preserving transformation (i.e. $A \in \mathcal{S}$ implies $T^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{S}$, and $P(T^{-1}(A)) = P(A)$, the entropy is defined as follows. If $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, ..., A_k\}$ is a measurable partition of $\Omega$, then

$$H(A) = \sum_i \varphi(P(A_i)),$$

where $\varphi(x) = -xlogx$, if $x > 0$, and $\varphi(0) = 0$. Denote by $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}(\mathcal{A})$ the common refinement of the partitions $\mathcal{A}, T^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) = \{T^{-1}(A_1), ..., T^{-1}(A_k)\}, ..., T^{-(n-1)}(\mathcal{A}) = \{T^{-(n-1)}(A_1), ..., T^{-(n-1)}(A_k)\}$. Then there exists

$$h(\mathcal{A}, T) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}(\mathcal{A})) \tag{1}$$

and the Kolomogorov - Sinaj entropy is defined by the formula

$$h(T) = \sup\{h(\mathcal{A}, T); \mathcal{A} \text{ is a measurable partition of } \Omega\}. \tag{2}$$

Let us try to substitute partitions by fuzzy partitions $\mathcal{A} = \{f_1, ..., f_k\}$, where $f_j$ are non-negative, measurable functions, $\sum_{i=1}^k f_i = 1_\Omega$. Put $m(f_i) = \int_\Omega f_i$ dP. The common refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{g_1, ..., g_l\}$ is defined using products of functions: $\mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B} = \{f_i.g_j; i = 1, ..., k, j = 1, ..., l\}$. Further $T^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) = \{f_1 \circ T, ..., f_k \circ T\}$. Then the entropy can be defined by the formula

$$H(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \varphi(m(f_i)),$$

---

[*] M. Bel University, Tajovského 40, 97401 Banská Bystrica, Matematický ústav SAV, Štefánikova 49, 81473 Bratislava,`riecan@fpv.umb.sk, riecan@mat.savba.sk`

and then by (1) and (2). Of course, in this case $h(T)=\infty$, if e.g. the supremum is taken over the all measurable partitions. Therefore P. Maličký suggested ([6], see also [14], [15]) the following modification: instead of $H(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ to use

$$H_n(\mathcal{A},T)=\inf\{H(\mathcal{C});\mathcal{C}\geq\mathcal{A},\mathcal{C}\geq T^{-1}(\mathcal{A}),...,\mathcal{C}\geq T^{-(n-1)}(\mathcal{A})\} \tag{3}$$

and then to define the entropy by the formula

$$h(\mathcal{A},T)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}H_n(\mathcal{A},T). \tag{4}$$

A natural algebraization of a tribe of functions is an MV-algebra. On a special type of MV-algebras - so-called MV-algebras with product ([8],[13]) there has been realized the construction of entropy in [11],[12]. In the paper, following the Maličký construction (3), (4), we construct entropy on any MV-algebra. Secondly, we need only additivity of considered states instead of usually demended $\sigma$-additivity.

In Section 2 we present necessary informations about MV-algebras and some auxiliary results concerning partitions of unity. Then in Section 3 we prove the existence of entropy. Section 4 registers basic facts about isomorphism and entropy and Section 5 contains a counting formula.

## 2 MV-algebras

An MV-algebra $M=(M,0,1,\neg,\oplus,\odot)$ is a system where $\oplus$ is associative and commutative with neutral element 0, and, in addition, $\neg 0=1,\neg 1=0,x\oplus 1=1,x\odot y=\neg(\neg x\oplus\neg y)$, and $y\oplus\neg(y\oplus\neg x)=x\oplus\neg(x\oplus\neg y)$ for all $x,y\in M$.

MV-algebras stand to the infinite-valued calculus of Lukasiewicz as boolean algebras stand to classical two-valued calculus.

An example of an MV-algebra is the real unit interval [0,1] equipped with the operations

$$\neg x=1-x,x\oplus y=\min(1,x+y),x\odot y=\max(0,x+y-1)$$

It is interesting that any MV-algebra has a similar structure. Let $G$ be a lattice-ordered Abelian group (shortly $l$-group). Let $u\in G$ be a strong unit of $G$, i.e. for all $g\in G$ there exists and integer $n\geq 1$ such that $nu\geq g$. Let $\Gamma(G,u)$ be the unit interval $[0,u]=\{h\in G;0\leq h\leq u\}$ equipped with the operations

$$\neg g=u-g,g\oplus h=u\wedge(g+h),g\odot h=0\vee(g+h-u).$$

Then $([0,u],0,u,\neg,\oplus,\odot)$ is an MV-algebra and by the Mundici theorem ([9]), up to isomorphism, every MV-algebra $M$ can be identified with the unit interval of a unique $l$-group $G$ with strong unit, $M=\Gamma(G,u)$.

A partition of unity $u$ in $M$ is an $k$-tuple $\mathcal{A}=(a_1,...,a_k)$ of elements of $M$ such that

$$a_1+...+a_k=u.$$

If $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$, and $\mathcal{B} = \{c_1, ...., c_k\}$ are partitions of unity, then their common refinement is any matrix $\mathcal{S} = \{c_{ij}; i = 1, ..., k, j = 1, ...l\}$ of elements of $M$ such that

$$a_i = \sum_{j=1}^{l} c_{ij}, i = 1, ..., k, b_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_{ij}, j = 1, ..., l$$

Although in view of the Mundici theorem the next result is known ([5] Prop. 2.2 (c), see also [7]), we mention the proof.

**Lemma 1.** *To any partitions $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ there exists their common refinement.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, ..., a_n\}, \mathcal{B} = \{b_1, b_2, ..., b_m\}$. By the well known Riesz theorem, to any $a, b, c$ such that $0 \leq a \leq b + c, b \geq 0, c \geq 0$ there exist $d, e$ such that $0 \leq d \leq b, 0 \leq e \leq c$, and $a = d + e$. (Indeed, put $d = a \wedge b, e = a - a \wedge b$.) This property can be generalized by induction for a finite number of elements. Therefore, since $a_1 \leq b_1 + b_2 + ... + b_m = u$, there exist $c_{11}, c_{12}, ..., c_{1m}$ such that

$$c_{1i} \leq b_i (i = 1, ...., m),$$

and

$$a_1 = c_{11} + c_{12} + ... + c_{1m}.$$

Since $a_2 \leq u - a_1 = (b_1 - c_{11}) + (b_2 - c_{12}) + ... + (b_m - c_{1m})$, there exist $c_{2i} (i = 1, 2, ..., m)$ such that

$$c_{2i} \leq b_i - c_{1i} (i = 1, 2, ..., m),$$

and

$$a_2 = c_{21} + c_{22} + ... + c_{2m}.$$

Continuing the process we construct $c_{3i} (i = 1, 2, ..., m)$ such that

$$c_{3i} \leq b_i - c_{1i} - c_{2i} (i = 1, 2, ..., m),$$

and

$$a_3 = c_{31} + c_{32} + ... + c_{3m}.$$

After constructing $c_{n-1,1}, c_{n-1,2}, ...c_{n-1,m}$ with $c_{n-1,i} \leq b_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} c_{ji}, a_{n-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{n-1,j}$, we put

$$c_{ni} = b_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_{ji} (i = 1, ..., m)$$

Then evidently

$$b_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ji} (i = 1, ..., m),$$

and

$$c_{n1} + c_{n2} + ... + c_{nm} = b_1 + ... + b_m - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_{ji}$$

$$= u - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_{ji} = u - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_j = a_n.$$

**Remark.** Common refinements of partitions are not defined uniquely. E.g. let $M =$

$[0,1], \mathcal{A} = \{0.5, 0.5\}, \mathcal{B} = \{0.4, 0.6\}$. Then any matrix

$$t - 0.1; 0.5 - t$$

$$0.6 - t;\ \ t$$

$t \in [0.1, 0.5]$ represents a common refinement of $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$.

# 3 Entropy of dynamical systems

**Definition 1.** *By a dynamical system on an MV-algebra we understand a couple of mappings $m : M \to [0,1], \tau : M \to M$ satisfying the following conditions:*

*(i)* $if a = b + c, then\, m(a) = m(b) + m(c), \tau(a) = \tau(b) + \tau(c)$

*(ii)* $\tau(u) = u, m(u) = 1$

*(iii)* $m(\tau(a)) = m(a), a \in M$

**Definition 2.** *If $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ is a partition of unity, then its entropy is defined by the formula*

$$H(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(m(a_i)),$$

*where $\varphi(x) = -xlogx$, if $x > 0, \varphi(0) = 0$.*

**Definition 3.** *If $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}, \mathcal{B} = \{b_1, ..., b_k\}$ are two partitions of unity and $\mathcal{C} = \{c_{ij}; i = 1, ..., n, j = 1, ..., m\}$ is a common refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, then we define $H_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} m(b_j)\varphi(\frac{m(c_{ij})}{m(b_j)})$.*

**Lemma 2.** $H_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B}) \leq H(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. Fix $i$, and put $\alpha_j = m(b_j), x_j = \frac{m(c_{ij})}{m(b_j)}, j = 1, ..., k$. Then $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j = m(u) = 1$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j x_j = \sum_{j=1}^{k} m(c_{ij}) = m(\sum_{j=1}^{k} c_{ij}) = m(a_i).$$

Since $\varphi$ is concave, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \varphi(x_j) \leq \varphi(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j x_j),$$

hence

$$H_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{k} m(b_j)\varphi(\frac{m(c_{ij})}{m(b_j)}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\alpha_j\varphi(x_j) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\alpha_j x_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(m(a_i)) = H(\mathcal{A}).$$

**Lemma 3.** *$H(\mathcal{C}) = H(\mathcal{A}) + H_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$ for any common refinement $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. It follows by the additivity of logarithms.

$$H(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\varphi(c_{ij}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\varphi(m(a_i)\frac{m(c_{ij})}{m(a_i)})$$

$$= -\sum_i\sum_j m(c_{ij}) logm(a_i) - \sum_i\sum_j m(c_{ij}\log\frac{m(c_{ij})}{m(a_i)}$$

$$= -\sum_i \log m(a_i)\sum_j m(c_{ij}) + \sum_i\sum_j m(a_i)\varphi(\frac{m(c_{ij})}{m(a_j)})$$

$$= -\sum_i m(a_i)\log m(a_i) + H_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$$

$$= H(\mathcal{A}) + H_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$$

**Corollary.** *For any common refinement $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ there holds $H(\mathcal{C}) \leq H(\mathcal{A}) + H(\mathcal{B})$.*

**Lemma 4.** *For any partition $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, ...., a_n\}$ put $\tau((\mathcal{A}) = \{\tau(a_1), ..., \tau(a_n)\}$. Then $\tau(\mathcal{A})$ is a partition of unity, too. Moreover, $H(\tau(\mathcal{A})) = H(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. By (i) and (iii) of the definition of dynamical system we have

$$\tau(a_1) + \tau(a_2) + ... + \tau(a_n) = \tau(a_1 + ... + a_n) = \tau(u) = u.$$

Moreover, by (iii)

$$H(\tau(\mathcal{A})) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(m(\tau(a_i))) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(m(a_i)) = H(\mathcal{A}).$$

**Definition 3.** *For any partition $\mathcal{A}$ of unity and any positive integer $n$ we define $H_n(\mathcal{A},\tau) = \inf\{H(\mathcal{C}); \mathcal{C}$ is a common refinement of $\mathcal{A}, \tau(\mathcal{A}), ..., \tau^{(n-1)}(\mathcal{A})\}$.*

**Theorem 1.** *There exists $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}H_n(\mathcal{A},T)$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $H_{n+m}(\mathcal{A},\tau) \leq H_n(\mathcal{A},\tau) + H_m(\mathcal{A},\tau)$.We shall use the following notation: $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B}$, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a common refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be partitions of unity such that

$$\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{A} \vee \tau(\mathcal{A}) \vee ... \vee \tau^{(n-1)}(\mathcal{A}), \tag{5}$$

$$\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{A} \vee \tau(\mathcal{A}) \vee ... \vee \tau^{(m-1)}(\mathcal{A}). \tag{6}$$

By (6) we obtain

$$\tau^n(\mathcal{D}) \in \tau^n(\mathcal{A}) \vee \tau^{n+1}(\mathcal{A}) \vee \ldots \vee \tau^{n+m-1}(\mathcal{A}). \tag{7}$$

Finally consider any partition $\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C} \vee \tau_n(\mathcal{D}). \tag{8}$$

By (8), (5) and (7) we obtain

$$\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{A} \vee \tau(\mathcal{A}) \vee \ldots \vee \tau^{n+m-1}(\mathcal{A}),$$

hence

$$H_{n+m}(\mathcal{A}) \leq H(\mathcal{E}).$$

Of course, by (8), Corollary and Lemma 4

$$H(\mathcal{E}) \leq H(\mathcal{C}) + H(\tau_n(\mathcal{D}))$$

$$= H(\mathcal{C}) + H(\mathcal{D}),$$

hence

$$H_{n+m}(\mathcal{A}) \leq H(\mathcal{C}) + H(\mathcal{D}). \tag{9}$$

Fix for a moment $\mathcal{D}$. Since (9) holds for any $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{A} \vee \tau(\mathcal{A}) \vee \ldots \vee \tau^{(n-1)}(\mathcal{A})$, by the definition of $H_n(\mathcal{A})$ we obtain

$$H_{n+m}(\mathcal{A}) - H(\mathcal{D}) \leq H_n(\mathcal{A}),$$

and by a similar argument

$$H_{n+m}(\mathcal{A}) - H_n(\mathcal{A}) \leq H_m(\mathcal{A}).$$

# 4 Isomorphism

The aim of the Kolmogorov - Sinaj entropy was to distinguish non -isomorphic dynamical systems. If $T \sim T'$ implies $h(T) = h(T')$, then dynamical systems $T, T'$ with different entropies $h(T) \neq h(T')$ cannot be isomorphic.

**Definition 4.** *Entropy of an MV-algebra dynamical system* $(M, m, \tau)$ *is defined by the formula*

$$h(\tau) = \sup\{h(\mathcal{A}, \tau); \mathcal{A} \textit{ is a partition of unity}\}$$

*where*

$$h(\mathcal{A},\tau) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_n(\mathcal{A},\tau).$$

**Definition 5.** *Two MV-algebra dynamical systems* $(M_1, m_1, \tau_1), (M_2, m_2, \tau_2)$ *are equivalent, if there exists a mapping* $\psi : M_1 \to M_2$ *satisfying the following conditions:*

- *(i)* $\psi$ *is a bijection*
- *(ii)* $if\ a, b, c \in M_1, a = b + c, then\ \psi(a) = \psi(b) + \psi(c).$
- *(iii)* $\psi(u_1) = u_2$
- *(iv)* $m_2(\psi(a)) = m_1(a)$ *for any* $a \in M_1$
- *(v)* $\tau_2(\psi(a)) = \psi(\tau_1(a))$ *for any* $a \in M_1$

**Theorem 2.** *If* $(M_1, m_1, \tau_1)$ *and* $(M_2, m_2, \tau_2)$ *are equivalent, then* $h(\tau_1) = h(\tau_2)$.

Proof. If $\mathcal{A}$ is any partition of $u_1$, then $\psi(\mathcal{A})$ is a partition of $u_2$, and $H(\mathcal{A}) = H(\psi(\mathcal{A}))$. Let $\varepsilon$ be an arbitrary positive number. Choose a common refinement $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{A}, ..., \tau_1^{n-1}(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$H_n + \varepsilon > H(\mathcal{C}).$$

Evidently $H(\mathcal{C}) \geq H_n(\psi(\mathcal{A}))$. Since

$$H_n(\mathcal{A}) + \varepsilon \geq H_n(\psi(\mathcal{A}))$$

holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$H_n(\mathcal{A}) \geq H_n(\psi(\mathcal{A})),$$

hence

$$h_1(\tau_1, \mathcal{A}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_n(\mathcal{A}) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_n(\psi(\mathcal{A})) = h_2(\tau_2, \psi(\mathcal{A})),$$

$$h_1(\tau_1) = \sup\{h_1(\tau_1, \mathcal{A}); \mathcal{A}\} \geq h_2(\tau_2, \psi(\mathcal{A})).$$

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be any partition of $u_2$. Then $\mathcal{A} = \psi^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$ is a partition of $u_1$ and $\psi(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}$. Therefore

$$h_1(\tau_1) \geq h_2(\tau_2, \psi(\mathcal{A})) = h_2(\tau_2, \mathcal{B})$$

for any $\mathcal{B}$, hence $h_1(\tau_1) \geq h_2(\tau_2)$.

# 5 MV-algebras with product

MV-algebra with product (see [8], [13], [14]) is a pair $(M,.)$, where $M$ is an MV-algebra, and $\cdot$ is a commutative and associative operation on $M$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i) $u.a = a$;

(ii) $if\ a,b,c \in M, a+b \leq u,\ then\ c.a + c.b \leq u,\ and\ c.(a+b) = c.a + c.b.$

In MV-algebras with product a suitable theory of entropy of the Kolmogorov type has been constructed in [12]. Of course, the construction is different. The main idea is the following. If $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1,...,a_k\}, \mathcal{B} = \{b_1,...,b_l\}$ are two partitions of unity, then one defines

$$\mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B} = \{a_i.b_j; i = 1,...,k, j = 1,...,l\}.$$

The entropy is defined by the formula

$$\overline{h}(\mathcal{A},\tau) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \tau^i(\mathcal{A})).$$

Evidently $\mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B}$ is a common refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Therefore

$$H_n(\mathcal{A},\tau) \leq H(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \tau^i(\mathcal{A})),$$

and

$$h(\mathcal{A},\tau) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_n(\mathcal{A},\tau) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \tau^i(\mathcal{A})) = \overline{h}(\mathcal{A},\tau).$$

We want to study some relations between $h(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ and $\overline{h}(\mathcal{A},\tau)$. Of course, we shall assume that the given MV-algebra is *divisible,* i.e. to any $a \in M$ and any $n \in N$ there exists $b \in M$ such that $a = n.b$. As it has been shown in [4] any divisible $\sigma$-complete MV-algebra $M$ admits a product such that $(M,.)$ is an MV-algebra with product.

**Theorem 3.** *Let $M$ be a divisible $\sigma$-complete MV-algebra, $m$ be continuous, positive state on $M$ (i.e. $m(a) = 0 \Longrightarrow a = 0$). If $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1,...,a_k\}, \mathcal{B} = \{b_1,...,b_l\}$ are partitions of unity, and $\mathcal{A}$ consists of idempotents (i.e. $a_i \oplus a_i = a_i$ for all i), then $\mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B}$ is the unique common refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. Our main tool is the Dvurečenskij and Mundici modification of the Loomis - Sikorski theorem ([2], [10]). By [3] Theorem 7.2.6 there exists a compact Hausdorff space $\Omega$, a family $\mathcal{T}$ of functions $f : \Omega \to [0,1]$ and a mapping $\psi : \mathcal{T} \to M$ satisfying the following properties:

(i) $\mathcal{T}$ is a tribe, i.e. $1_\Omega \in \mathcal{T}, 1 - f \in \mathcal{T}$ whenever $f \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\min\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}, 1\} \in \mathcal{T}$, whenever $f_n \in \mathcal{T}\ (n = 1,2,...)$;

(ii) the natural product $f.g \in \mathcal{T}$, whenever $f \in \mathcal{T}, g \in \mathcal{T}$;

(iii) $\psi$ is an MV-$\sigma$-homomorphism from $\mathcal{T}$ onto $M$ preserving the product in $\mathcal{T}$.

Since $M$ is divisible and $\sigma$-complete, the tribe $\mathcal{T}$ contains all constant functions. Indeed, by [3] theorem 7.1.22 $\Omega$ consists of all functions $m : M \to [0,1]$ satisfying the identity $m(a \oplus b) = \min(m(a) + m(b), 1)$, and the tribe $\mathcal{T}$ is generated by the family of all functions $\widehat{a} : \Omega \to [0,1]$ defined by $\widehat{a}(m) = m(a), a \in M$. Of course, divisibility of $M$ implies for any $q \in N$ the existence of $\frac{1}{q}u$ such that $qm(\frac{1}{q}u) = 1$. If $r \in Q, r = \frac{p}{q}$, then $\widehat{ru}(m) = m(ru) = pm(\frac{1}{q}u) = p\frac{1}{q}m(u) = r$, hence the constant function $r_\Omega$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}$. Finally $\sigma$-completeness of $M$ implies that $\mathcal{T}$ contains all constant functions $\alpha_\Omega$, $\alpha \in [0,1]$.

Since $\mathcal{T}$ contains all constant fuzzy sets, by the Butnariu - Klement theorem ([1] Prop. 3.3., [15] Theorem 7.1.7) $\mathcal{T}$ consists of all $\mathcal{S}$-measurable functions, where $\mathcal{S} = \{A \subset \Omega; \chi_A \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

Define $\mu : \mathcal{T} \to [0,1]$ by $\mu(f) = m(\psi(f))$. Evidently $\mu$ is a continuous state on the $MV$-algebra $\mathcal{T}$. There exists a probability measure $P : \mathcal{S} \to [0,1]$ such that $\mu(f) = \int_\Omega f dP$ for any $f \in \mathcal{T}$.

Let $\{c_{ij}; i = 1, ..., k, j = 1, ..., l\}$ be any common refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Since $\psi$ is epimorphism, there are $f_1, ..., f_k, g_1, ..., g_l, h_{ij} \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\psi(f_i) = a_i, \psi(g_j) = b_j, \psi(h_{ij}) = c_{ij}$. Since $a_i$ are idempotent, it is not difficult to see ([3] Prop. 7.1.20) that $f_i = \chi_{A_i}$. We have P-almost everywhere

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} h_{ij} = \chi_{A_i}, \sum_{i=1}^{k} h_{ij} = g_j, i = 1, ..., k, j = 1, ..., l.$$

Therefore

$$h_{ij} = \chi_{A_i}.g_j,$$

P-a.e., hence

$$c_{ij} = \psi(h_{ij}) = \psi(\chi_{A_i}).\psi(g_j) = a_i.b_j.$$

**Corollary.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3 be satisfied. If $\mathcal{A}$ consists of idempotent elements, then*

$$h(\mathcal{A}, \tau) = \overline{h}(\mathcal{A}, \tau).$$

**Theorem 4.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3 be satisfied. If $\mathcal{A}$ consists of idempotent elements, then for any partition $\mathcal{B}$ there holds the inequality*

$$h(\mathcal{B}, \tau) \leq h(\mathcal{A}, \tau) + H(\mathcal{B} \| \mathcal{A})$$

*where*

$$H(\mathcal{B} \| \mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{l} m(b_j) \varphi(\frac{m(a_i.b_j)}{m(b_j)}).$$

Proof. It follows by [12] Prop. 8 and the above Corollary.

**Remark.** Theorem 4 presents a basic tool for counting entropy in some structures. For details see e.g. [15], Chapter 10.

**Acknowledgement.** The author thanks to Professors Daniele Mundici and Anatolij Dvurečenskij for many fruitful discussions and suggestions. The paper was supported by Grant VEGA 1/9056/02.

## References

[1] Butnariu, D. - Klement, E.P.: Triangular Norm/based Measures and Games with Fuzzy Conditions. Kluwer, Dordrecht 1993.

[2] Dvurečenskij, A.: Loomis - Sikorski theorem for $\sigma$-complete MV-algebras and $l$-groups. J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser A 68, 2000, 261 - 277.

[3] Dvurečenskij, A. - Pulmannová, S.: New Trends in Quantum Structures. Kluwer, Dordrecht 2000.

[4] Dvurečenskij, A. - Riečan, B.: Weakly divisible MV-algebras and product. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 234, 1999, 208 - 222.

[5] Goodearl, K.: Partially Ordered Abelian Groups with Interpolation. Math, Surveys and Monographs No. 20, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island 1986.

[6] Maličký, P. - Riečan, B.: On the entropy of dynamical systems. In: Proc. Conf. Ergodic Theory and related Topics II (H. Michel ed.) Teubner, Leipzig 1986, 135 - 138.

[7] Marra, V.: Every Abelian l-group is ultrasimplicial. J. Algebra 225, 2000, 872 - 884.

[8] Montagna, F.: An algebraic approach to propositional fuzzy logic. J. Logic. Lang. Inf. 9, 2000, 91 - 124.

[9] Mundici, D.: Interpretation of AFC*-algebras in Lukasiewicz sentential calculus. J.. Functional Analysis 65, 1986, 15 - 63.

[10] Mundici, D.: Tensor products and the Loomis-Sikorski theorem for MV-algebras. Advan. Appl. Math. 22, 1999, 227 - 248.

[11] Petrovičová, J.: On the entropy of partitions in product MV-algebras. Soft Computing 4, 2000, 41 - 44.

[12] Petrovičová, J.: On the entropy of dynamical systems in product MV-algebras. Fuzzy Sets and Systems 121, 2001, 347 - 351.

[13] Riečan, B.: On the product MV algebras. Tatra Mt. Math. Publ. 16, 1999, 143 - 149.

[14] Riečan, B. - Mundici, D.: Probability on MV-algebras. In: Handbook of Measure Theory (E.Pap ed.). North Holland, Amsterdam 2002, 869 - 909.

[15] Riečan, B. - Neubrunn, T.: Integral, Measure, and Ordering. Kluwer, Dordrecht 1997.